

## REMARKS

Contrary to the contentions of the Examiner, Shiao does not disclose a groove on the outer periphery of circular adapter 20. In particular, the outer and inner circles in Figure 2 of Shiao show that the outer and inner extent of the teeth extend around the complete periphery of adapter 20. As clearly shown in the portion where the numeral "22" is pointed in Figure 2 of Shiao, there is no groove and there is no reason to include a groove due to the enlarged, free ends of C-shaped ring 141. It is then respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 1 (amended), 19, 25, claim 27 (amended) and 30 and the claims which depend therefrom has been overcome. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Additionally, claims 43, 44 and 47-49 have been added to further define the present invention in a manner to further distinguish over Shiao. Favorable consideration of claims 43, 44 and 47-49 is respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is misconstruing some of the recitations of claims 4, 15 and 30 while ignoring other recitations. Specifically, claims 4, 15 and 30 are directed to the biasing means of Figures 1-5 and 7 of the present application wherein the peg 61 is received into the elastic member 62. In particular, as shown in Figures 5 and 6 of Gordon Tool, both ends of the spring are received in the receptacle rather than having a second end outside the receptacle as recited in claims 4, 15 and 30 as originally filed, and the peg and neither of its ends are received in the spring, also in contradistinction to the recitations of claims 4, 15 and 30 as originally filed. It is then respectfully submitted that the rejections of claims 4, 15 and 30 and the claims which depend therefrom have been overcome for this separate and independent reason.

Claims 8, 21 and 34 specifically recite a second receptacle included in the second end of

the peg, i.e. receptacle 911 in peg 91 of Figures 8 and 9. Neither Hare nor Gordon show or suggest such a receptacle. It is then respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 8, 21 and 34 has been overcome for this separate and independent reason. For completeness, although receptacles for receiving springs are well known (as an example see Tuttle cited by the Examiner), its use in the particular selection and arrangement of components is both novel and unobvious over the prior art. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

As set forth in the specification of the present application at page 1, line 8 and following, cap 39 and wall 44 increase assembly time and manufacture cost and adversely affect the appearance, and the use of separate wall 44 is required to allow formation of the incline of the lower wall of passage 25. Claims 7, 11, 14, 18, 20, 24, 26, 33, 35, 38, 39, and 40, have been amended and claims 41 and 42 have been added to further define the present invention in a manner to further distinguish over Hare. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

With respect to the double-patenting rejection, it should initially be noted that Gordon does not teach the biasing means recited in the claims of the present application as set forth previously and in contradistinction to the contention of the Examiner. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the double-patenting rejection has been overcome. Additionally, it should be appreciated that the claims of the present application and of Application No. 09/541,190 are directed to different inventive concepts and there is no overlap. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the double-patenting rejection has been overcome for this separate and independent reason.

The Examiner has cited the United States Patent listed in NOTICE OF REFERENCES CITED as C-F. By the lack of application of these references and others like them within the classes or subclasses searched (including but not limited to those cited in Appln. No. 09/541,190), the Examiner apparently recognizes the clear patentability of the present invention

over any of these references.

Therefore, since the claims of the present application have been shown to include limitations directed to the features of applicant's reversible ratchet-type wrench which are neither shown, described, taught, nor alluded to in any of the references cited by the Examiner, whether those references are taken singly or in any combination, the Examiner is requested to allow claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 11-16, 18-22, 24-27, 29-31 and 33-49, as amended, of the present application and to pass this application to issue.


The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned if there are any obstacles to the allowance of the present invention so that such obstacles can be mutually resolved.


Respectfully submitted,

Bobby Hu

Dated: January 30, 2001

By

  
Alan D. Kamrath, Reg. No. 28,227  
Rider, Bennett, Egan & Arundel, LLP  
333 South Seventh Street, Suite 2000  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Telephone: (612) 340-8925



RECEIVED  
FEB -7 2001  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800